



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

given by the recipients to those from whom they are drawn, as is the case with most of site rent. It is the more surprising that Professor Carver did not call attention to this point since he so clearly favors increased taxes on unearned incomes, and since he advocates increased taxes on land as such (not merely, it appears, on future increases in its value), and on inheritances, as part of his "liberalist's program."¹ Indeed, if a few more economists of Professor Carver's reputation should so frankly advocate land-value taxation, it might almost be possible for younger economists to class themselves as, fundamentally, single-tax sympathizers without thereby losing caste within the profession.

H. G. BROWN.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

A REJOINDER

IN case the nineteen laborers decided to accept lower wages and continue growing wheat, there need not be, as Professor Brown points out, any diminution in the total product. The result would simply be lower wages, higher rent, and the same total product as before. This is in agreement with my argument as previously published.

In case, however, the nineteen laborers decide to enter some other calling it must, of course, be a somewhat more remunerative one than wheat growing under the new conditions. It could not, however, be so remunerative as wheat growing had been under the earlier conditions before the assumed rise in the price of wool, otherwise they would not have been growing wheat in preference to following this new occupation. In short, their wages are somewhat reduced by the enforced change as compared with what they were formerly getting, but not so much reduced as they would be if they had no alternative employment but were compelled to con-

¹ Pp. 583-584.

tinue growing wheat at such wages as would leave the land owner as high rent as he might get by turning his land into sheep pasture. When this alternative occupation is open, the changes assumed would raise rent and reduce wages somewhat, but not so much as in the other case.

Will these changes, as Professor Brown says, raise rent *more* than they will lower wages? Yes, if we are thinking of world economy; not necessarily if we are thinking of national economy. In order to find a satisfactory alternative employment, the nineteen laborers may emigrate. In case they do, the national product will obviously be reduced, and will support a smaller population, tho the landowner's rent would be slightly increased. From the standpoint of world economy, the increase of the total productivity of industry is probably not among the theoretical possibilities of protectionism. From the standpoint of national economy, it is. The protectionist is, rightly or wrongly, commonly a nationalist; and from his point of view he finds here at least a theoretical possibility.

T. N. CARVER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

A RE-REJOINDER

IN my criticism of Professor Carver's book, I assumed the alternative industries into which labor would go in case wheat production were abandoned, to be alternative industries *in the same country*. But if, in the supposed case (admittedly, of course, seldom realized) of landowners profiting at the expense of laborers because of free trade, the laborers emigrate, then it is entirely correct to say, as Professor Carver does say, that free trade would diminish *total* national wealth. It deserves to be pointed out, however (and I presume Professor Carver will agree with me in this) that free trade would even then increase the *per capita* wealth of the country in question. It would fail to do this, in a mathematical sense, in one contin-